

Appln No. 09/726,028  
Second Amendment Under Rule 116 dated Feb. 2, 2004  
Reply to Advisory Office action dated Jan. 23, 2004


### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By the foregoing amendment now submitted following the Advisory Action dated Jan. 23, 2004, (a) cancellation of finally rejected claim 1 and non-elected claim 10 is proposed and (b) allowable claims 2-9 are retained with claims 2, 5 and 6 to be recast in independent form.

According to the Advisory Action claims 6-9 are allowed when claim 6 is recast in independent form as now proposed, while claims 2-5 are no longer rejected but are merely objected to, presumably because of their dependency from finally rejected claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2 and 5 considered to be allowable when recast in independent form, (according to the telephone conversation had with the Examiner on Jan. 30, 2004) are also to be recast in independent form, as in the case of claim 6, so as to place all of claims 2-9 in allowable form.

In view of the foregoing, entry of the Second Rule 116 Amendment now submitted is expected so as to place the application in condition for allowance based on allowed claims 2-9.

Respectfully submitted,

  
JACOB SHUSTER, Reg. No. 19,660  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Tele: (301) 227-1835

OFFICE OF COUNSEL CODE 39  
NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER  
CARDEROCK DIVISION HEADQUARTERS  
DAVID TAYLOR MODEL BASIN  
9500 MACARTHUR BOULEVARD  
WEST BETHESDA, MD 20817-5700